

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 3-5 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims. In response, Applicants have herein amended independent Claims 3, 4 and 5 to further define the present invention as novel over the prior art. Support for the claim amendments can be found on page 15, lines 2-7 as well as page 20, lines 15-19 of the present specification.

**The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,907,703 to Kronenberg et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,241,670 to Eastridge et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,092 to Francis et al, and on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kronenberg in view of Eastridge and further in view of Francis and still further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,051 to Becker et al.

**The Present Invention**

The present invention simplifies the tasks that programmers need to carry out to manipulate (e.g., load and save) archives. This is accomplished by providing a common archive interface which is utilized by the programmer to access archive files of varying formats. The common archive interface implements a set of methods or instructions which the programmer can utilize to manipulate the files, and which automatically and transparently to the programmer loads and saves

the files appropriately without regard as to the format (archive, directory, etc.) in which the files are stored.

Thus, a determination of the file structure is made, a loading strategy is created based on the determined file structure, a virtual archive is created comprising a stored list of proxies enabling the desired files to be located, with the list of proxies being stored in the virtual archive in an archive format, regardless of the format in which the original files were stored. Once all of the proxies are identified, upon the execution of a save function, a deferred copying process is performed on the contents of all of the files identified by the proxies, and the contents are stored in the archive file in a file format specified by the user. After storage, the archive files are retrieved in response to a user's request to access the stored content according to a loading strategy created based upon the format the user specified the archive to be stored in.

### **The Applicable Law**

With respect to obviousness, as set forth in the MPEP:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skilled in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.

MPEP 2143

### **The Amended Claims Are Not Obvious In View of the Cited Art**

Neither Kronenberg, nor Eastridge, nor Francis, nor Becker teach or suggest the creation of a virtual archive using a loading strategy wherein the loading strategy is determined based upon the format of the files to be archived, with the virtual archive comprising a stored list of proxies enabling

the files identified in a requested file set to be located, and then performing a deferred copying process on the contents of all of the files in the file set and storing the contents to an archive on disk in a file format specified by a user, wherein the contents are retrieved by one of the loading strategies creating according to the file format specified by the user. All of these elements are round in the present claims.

Kronenberg discloses a generic loading and storage strategy that is identical for any format of file to be loaded and stored. Kronenberg provides no feature that allows a user to specify which file format contents will be saved as is specifically claimed in each independent claim of the present invention and loaded according to a loading strategy created based upon the specified format. Similarly, neither Eastridge nor Becker nor Francis teaches or suggests such a limitation. Without such teaching or suggestion, the present claims are patentable over Kronenberg, Eastridge, Francis and Becker, both alone and in any combination. Since the claims now expressly recite these features, it is submitted that the claimed invention is patentable over the prior art and is in condition for allowance.

### **Conclusion**

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,

March 31, 2008  
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/  
Mark D. Simpson, Esq.  
Registration No. 32,942

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP  
1101 Market Street  
Suite 2600  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
Telephone: (215) 923-4466  
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189